

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MIGUEL A. CISNEROS,

Petitioner,

v.

TRENT ALLEN,

Respondent.

Case No. [24-cv-00822-HSG](#)

**ORDER DENYING REQUESTS FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 10, 11

Petitioner filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus, challenging his conviction from San Mateo County Superior Court. On June 17, 2024, the Court DISMISSED this action as duplicative of both C No. 20-cv-07861 HSG and C No. 22-cv-2961 HSG; denied a certificate of appealability, and entered judgment in favor of Respondent. Dkt. Nos. 8, 9. Petitioner has filed two requests for a 30-day extension of time to file a motion for reconsideration of the dismissal. Dkt. Nos. 10, 11. Petitioner alleges that he requires an extension of time because he does not have the materials or supplies to properly prepare a motion for reconsideration; he is disabled; he can barely read and write; he does not understand the court's orders and relies on other inmates to explain them to him; the prison is regularly shutdown; and the Court repeatedly denies his requests for counsel. *See id.* The Court DENIES the requests for an extension of time because Petitioner has unsuccessfully challenged this conviction multiple times,¹ and filed multiple motions for


¹ Petitioner has challenged this same conviction and sentence in prior habeas petitions. *See* C No. 16-cv-04110 HSG (dismissed for failure to file in forma pauperis application or pay filing fee); C No. 18-01877 HSG (dismissed for failure to exhaust state court remedies); C No. 18-cv-4049 (dismissed because filed while C No. 18-01877 HSG was pending; petition filed in C No. 18-cv-04049 filed in C No. 18-01877 HSG as proposed amended petition); C No. 19-cv-02606 HSG (dismissed as duplicative of C No. 18-01877 HSG); C No. 20-cv-07861 HSG (dismissed as untimely and procedurally defaulted); C No. 22-cv-2961 HSG (dismissed as second or successive to C No. 20-cv-07861 HSG).

1 reconsideration in the prior actions. In these prior actions, Petitioner has repeatedly raised the
2 same arguments and presumably will do so again in any motion for reconsideration filed in this
3 action. Petitioner has not demonstrated good cause for an extension of time to file a motion for
4 reconsideration that is likely to raise issues that he has already presented to the Court in prior
5 actions.

6 This order terminates Dkt. Nos. 10, 11.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: 8/1/2024

9 
10 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28